



3742

Attorney Docket No. 9817-000153

UNIT 3742
 EXAMINER Mark Paschall
 INVENTOR(S) Blok et al.
 SERIAL NUMBER 09/686,227
 FILED October 11, 2000
 FOR Conductive Polymer Compositions Containing N-N-m-phenylenedimaleimide and Devices

RESPONSE TRANSMITTAL AND
 EXTENSION OF TIME REQUEST
 (IF REQUIRED)

THE COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
 Washington, D. C. 20231

Sir:

FEE CALCULATION FOR ENCLOSED RESPONSE and EXTENSION REQUEST (if any)						
	Claims Remaining	Highest No. Previously Paid	Number Extra	Rate	Additional Fee	
Total Claims	29	- 29	= 0	\$18.00	=	0.00
Independent Claims	2	- 3	= 0	\$78.00	=	0.00
Surcharge For Multiple Dependent Claim First Added				+\$260.00	=	0.00
[] Applicant requests a _____ month extension of time for response to the outstanding Office Action. The large entity fee is						0.00
TOTAL						0.00
[] SMALL ENTITY STATUS (If applicable, divide TOTAL by 2)						0.00
[] Verified Statement enclosed, if not previously filed.						
[] Reduction for Extension Fee of _____ months already paid						0.00
[] OTHER: _____						0.00
TOTAL						0.00

[] A check is enclosed to cover the fees as calculated above.

[] The fees calculated above are to be charged to Deposit Account No. 08-0750.

If for some reason applicant has not requested a sufficient extension of time and/or has not paid a sufficient fee for this response and/or for the extension of time necessary to prevent the abandonment of this application, please consider this as a Request for an Extension for the required time period and/or an authorization to charge our Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any fee which may be due. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By: Robert M. Siminski
 Robert M. Siminski
 Reg. No. 36,007

P. O. Box 828
 Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
 (248) 641-1600

RECEIVED
 JAN 22 2001
 TC 3700 MAIL ROOM

I hereby certify that this letter, the response attached hereto and, if enclosed, the small entity verification are being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231, on January 12, 2001.

By Robert M. Siminski



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Art Unit: 3742
Examiner: Mark Paschall
Inventor: Blok et al.
Serial No: 09/686,227
Filed: October 11, 2000
For: Conductive Polymer
Compositions Containing
N-N-m-phenylenedimaleimide
and Devices
Attorney
Docket No.: 9817-000153

RESPONSIVE
AMENDMENT

1/22/01
RECEIVED
JAN 22 2001
TC 3700 MAIL ROOM

Hon. Commissioner of Patents
and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

Dear Sir:

In response to the Office Action mailed December 19, 2000, please reconsider the
above identified patent application in view of the following appended remarks.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-7, 9-22 and 24-29 currently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as
being unpatentable over either Carlet or Meyer in view of Kotian et al. In this regard, the

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

*I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as
first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington,
D.C. 20231 on January 13, 2001.*

By: Robert M. Sennrich